

SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA

**Instructions for using the attached Crosswalk Reference Document
for Review and Submission of Local Mitigation Plans
to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer and FEMA Regional Office**

Attached is a crosswalk reference document, which is based on the Final Draft Report ***State and Local Plan Interim Criteria Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000***, published by FEMA HQ and dated July 11, 2002. This document was based on the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 Interim Final Rule*, published February 26, 2002.

The purpose of the crosswalk is to provide a tool to local jurisdictions in developing and submitting Mitigation Plans under Section 322 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. The crosswalk can be used to assist local or multi-jurisdiction entities in the process of developing and reviewing Local or Multi-jurisdictional plan(s). Each Local or Multi-jurisdictional plan should be reviewed by the pertinent local jurisdictional entity prior to submitting the plan to the respective State. In addition as stated in the Interim Final Rule §201.6(d)(1) "Plans must be submitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for initial review and coordination. The State will then send the plan to the appropriate FEMA Regional Office for formal review and approval." The local jurisdiction must fill out column 3 prior to submitting the plan for formal review and approval.

Tribes may submit hazard mitigation plans through their respective states or they can directly submit their plans to FEMA Region VIII. This means they can write a Local or Multi-jurisdictional Plan as a sub-grantee or they may write a Standard or Enhanced State Plan as a Grantee. When tribes are considering how they want to develop and submit their plans, they need to consider whether or not they want to be Grantees directly from FEMA or Sub-grantees through their respective states. The deciding factor would be how they want to apply for and receive Pre-disaster Mitigation Grant projects, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects, or Flood Mitigation Assistance projects. Interested tribes can determine this by talking with their State Hazard Mitigation Officer or their respective FEMA Regional Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration (FIMA) Division. In any case, each tribe should review their own plans before submitting them to their state or FEMA Regional office.

Following are explanations of each column.

- Column 1 indicates on what page or pages in the *State and Local Plan Interim Criteria* document more detailed information can be found regarding the requirements.
- Column 2 references and directly quotes the *44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 Interim Final Rule*.
- Column 3 is for the tribe and/or local jurisdiction to indicate the Section or Annex and the page number(s) in their plan where the requirement is addressed.
- Column 4 provides space for State/FEMA comments and for scoring of the plan.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Local Requirement		
Local Plan Submitted to the State by:	Title:	Date:
Curtis Petrik	Sheridan County DES Coordinator	September 29, 2003

State Requirement		
State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Larry Akers	SHMO	October 10, 2003

FEMA Requirement		
FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Wade Nofziger Diana Heyder Donna Tucker Doug Bausch	Hazard Mitigation Specialist Hazard Mitigation Specialist Hazard Mitigation Specialist Program Specialist	December 2, 2003
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	October 14, 2003	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	XXX	
Date Approved	December 2, 2003	

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

Point of Contact: Curtis Petrik	Local Plan Reviewed by:	
Title: Sheridan County DES Coordinator	Title:	
Agency: Sheridan County	NFIP Status (Single Jurisdiction)	
Phone Number: 406-765-2970	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>

Multi-jurisdiction: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, list each jurisdiction below:)	N/A*	NFIP Status (for mapped communities)	
1. Sheridan County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Town of Medicine Lake	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Town of Outlook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Town of Plentywood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Town of Westby	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
6.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
8.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
9.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA REGION VIII

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN SUMMARY WORKSHEET

The plan cannot be reviewed if the prerequisite is not met for a single jurisdictional plan, or prerequisites are not met for a multi-jurisdictional plan.

All mandatory criteria, except those highlighted in gray, must receive a score of “**Satisfactory**” or “**Outstanding**” for the plan to receive FEMA approval. A less than “Satisfactory” score on subsections highlighted in gray will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer’s comments must be provided for requirements receiving a “**Needs Improvement**” score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

U – Unsatisfactory: The plan does not address the criteria.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan addresses the criteria, but needs significant improvement. Reviewer’s comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum criteria. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

O – Outstanding: The plan exceeds the minimum criteria. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite (s) (Check Applicable Box)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body:

§201.6(c)(5) **OR**

Multi-jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)
AND

Multi-jurisdictional Participation: §201.6(a)(3)

NOT MET	MET
	S
	S
	S

Planning Process

Documentation of the Planning Process:

§201.6(c)(1)

U	N	S	O
		S	

Risk Assessment

Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Profiling Hazard Events: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets:
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential
Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development
Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)

Multi-jurisdictional Risk Assessment:
§201.6(c)(2)(iii)

U	N	S	O
		S	
		S	
		S	
		S	
		S	
		S	

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures:
§201.6(c)(3)(ii)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures:
§201.6(c)(3)(iii)

Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy:
§201.6(c)(3)(iv)

U	N	S	O
		S	
		S	
		S	
		S	

Plan Maintenance Procedures

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan:
§201.6(c)(4)(i)

Implementation Through Existing Programs:
§201.6(c)(4)(ii)

Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

U	N	S	O
		S	
		S	
		S	

Additional State Requirements*

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

U	N	S	O

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT S--SATISFACTORY O--OUTSTANDING	
PREREQUISITE (S) (3-1)			NOTE: The prerequisite, or prerequisites in the case of multi-jurisdictional plans, must be met before the plan can be approved.	
Adoption by the Local Governing Body (3-2)	Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan shall include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council)...	Appendix A	S	Resolution dated August 27, 2003.
OR				
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption (3-3)	Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must document that it has been formally adopted.	Appendix A	S	Resolutions for the other four jurisdictions are listed in Appendix A.
AND				
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation (3-4)	Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted...participated in the process... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.	Section 2.0; Pages 8-9 Appendix B	S	The City resolutions indicate that they worked closely with the County in developing the mitigation plan.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
PLANNING PROCESS (3-5)			
Documentation of the Planning Process (3-6)	Requirement §201.6(c)(1): [The plan must document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.	Section 2.0; Pages 8-9 Appendix B	S Good public documentation of the planning process. They included many local, State, and Federal agencies. Public comments were consolidated.
RISK ASSESSMENT (3-9)			
Identifying Hazards (3-10)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type....of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction...	Sections 3.1 & 3.2 Pages 10-27	S Good information provided.
Profiling Hazard Events (3-14)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): Location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.	Sections 3.1, 3.2, & 3.4 Pages 10-27 & 31-32	S A historical summary is provided for each hazard. The tables in Section 3 include an estimate of frequency and magnitude of the potential events. Including participation by National Weather Service on the planning team resulted in an outstanding history of previous events, including wildfire.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview (Currently found under Identifying Assets section, p.3-18—to be corrected in next version of the <i>Plan Criteria</i>)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.	Sections 3.3 & 3.4; Pages 28-32	S Good job. Each hazard summary in Section 3 contains information on the impact to the community. The tables in Section 3 illustrate the vulnerability of each community to all high priority hazards identified above.
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets (3-18)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of: The types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas...	Section 3.3; Pages 28-30 Appendix C	S HAZUS inventories are used to estimate critical facility and general building stock exposure at the census block level to the identified hazards. The methodology is clearly explained and a summary of potential future projects is provided. In addition, census data are cited that indicate an overall 13.3% population decline in the last ten years. Well done. <i>Note: A less than "Satisfactory" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing</i>

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses (3-22)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate...	Section 3.5; Pages 35-41	S The vulnerability tables present potential losses by estimating exposure and risk to buildings, as well as societal risk. The methods used are clearly explained, and HAZUS '99 inventories are utilized. Additionally, the data shows overall potential costs. <i>Note: A less than “Satisfactory” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends (3-24)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.	Section 3.3; Page 30	S They indicate that the overall County population is shrinking and that no growth is occurring in the hazard areas. They also specifically describe 3 major proposed projects that are not in identified hazard areas. However, they also indicate an urgent need for floodplain mapping and regulations in the Big Muddy Creek and Box Elder Creek areas. Developing these types of mitigation measures is the intent of this section of the regulation. We suggest contacting the State Floodplain Administrator for the floodplain mapping issues. <i>Note: A less than “Satisfactory” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment (3-26)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment section must assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.	Tables 3-11 through 3-15; Pages 39-41	S The vulnerability tables provided in Section 3 include an assessment of each jurisdiction seeking plan approval.
MITIGATION STRATEGY (3-29)	<i>Note: Any changes made in the risk assessment to address previous unsatisfactory or needs improvement scores, will need to be reflected in the Mitigation Strategy section to gain final approval of the plan.</i>		
Local Hazard Mitigation Goals (3-30)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy shall include: a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.	Section 4.1; Page 42 Appendix D	S Long-term goals are provided on page 42 of the mitigation strategy, as well as the process used to develop them and which communities' identified each goal. In addition, both the County and City resolutions contain a purpose and goal statement. Well done.
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures (3-34)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.	Section 4.1, 4.2, & 4.3; Pages 42-44 Appendix D	S Good range of specific projects that need to be accomplished. The scope of these strategies includes response related improvements. The communities have done a great job in considering actions under all potential mitigation categories. This reflects the excellent participation of the planning team and stakeholders.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Implementation of Mitigation Measures (3-36)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii): [The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.	Sections 4.3 & 4.4; Pages 44-49	S Benefit/Costs were considered in the plan, to include prioritization and a scoring matrix. The LEPC and DES Coordinator play significant roles in the process. Also, DNRC is listed as a potential stakeholder in the Box Elder Dam seismic evaluation. The Dam Safety Officer is creating a statewide earthquake ground-shaking potential product that is geared towards assessing seismic vulnerability of dams.
Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy (3-40)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.	Table 4-2; Pages 45-47	S Well done. All of the jurisdictions seeking plan approval have identifiable action items in the mitigation strategy. They have clearly demonstrated their willingness to pursue actions in the mitigation strategy. Many of the issues are well thought out.
PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES (3-43)			
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan (3-44)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): Method and schedule of monitoring...updating the plan within a five-year cycle.	Section 5.1; Page 50	S A plan review will take place every two years, or as deemed necessary by knowledge of new hazards or vulnerabilities. The County DES Coordinator is responsible for the 5-year update.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - SHERIDAN COUNTY, MONTANA
REGION VIII

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Implementation Through Existing Programs (3-48)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate...	Section 5.2; Pages 50-51	S Mitigation goals are indicated to be adopted into the County's Comprehensive Growth Policy.
Continued Public Involvement (3-50)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.	Section 5.3; Page 51	S Good job in describing how the public will have the opportunity to continue their involvement in the process.